

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARIA DE LA LUZ BAUTISTA-PEREZ,
et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JUUL LABS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [20-cv-01613-HSG](#)

**ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO SEAL**


Re: Dkt. No. 119

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion to file their Motion to Compel and related papers under seal. Dkt. No. 119 ("Mot"). Plaintiffs filed this administrative motion pursuant to the parties' Protective Order because Defendants and other parties subject to the protective order designated certain information contained in the Motion to Compel as "Confidential" and "Highly Confidential." *See id.* But Plaintiffs themselves do not believe that there is good cause to file the Motion to Compel under seal and oppose the request. *Id.*

Under Civil Local Rule 79-5, Defendants, as the Designating Party, had 7 days of the administrative motion's filing (until May 5, 2021) to file a statement and/or declaration describing the applicable legal standard and the reasons for keeping the Motion to Compel under seal. Civil L.R. 79-5(f). That deadline has long passed, and they have not done so. The Civil Rules make clear that mere reference to a stipulation or protective order that allows a party to designate certain documents as confidential is not sufficient to establish that a document, or portions thereof, are sealable. *Id.* § 79-5(c). They also state that a failure to file a statement or declaration may result in the unsealing of the provisionally sealed document without further notice to the Designating Party. *Id.* § 79-5(f)(3).

//

IT IS SO ORDERED.


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge